

REMARKS

Claims 1-12 and 16-50 are now pending. Claims 49-50 are newly added. Continued examination and reconsideration of the Application are respectfully requested.

I. Office Action Remarks

The Remarks on page 2 of the Office action state that “the Applicant refers to the first and second user contexts however there is no disclosure that would allow the Examiner to uniquely ascertain what it includes or even what it is, thus it would be strongly recommended to include additional language that could clarify user context in greater detail.”

Applicant appreciates the opportunity to clarify the terms. Among others, example contexts may include one or more web page, environment, workspace, portal, profile, board, Uniform Resource Locator (URL) and/or link. These examples and others are described in the specification.

II. §102 Rejections

Claims 1-12 and 16-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,308,179 to Petersen et al. (“Petersen”). It is respectfully submitted that the Office action does not present a prima facie case of anticipation with respect to any of the rejected claims. Further, it is respectfully submitted that Petersen does not disclose all of the elements of the claims. Therefore, claims 1-13 and 16-48 are in condition for allowance.

Regarding independent claim 1, the Office action fails to identify what portion of Petersen allegedly teaches that the contextual metadata is associated with the user, the element of *automatically tagging contextual information related to the user, the software tool, and the first context to the data as contextual metadata upon one or more data operations being performed on the data while in*

the first context to which the software tool is associated, and the element of automatically tagging contextual information related to the user, the software tool, and the second context to the data as contextual metadata upon one or more data operations being performed on the data while in the second context to which the software tool is associated. For at least these reasons, the Office action fails to present a prima facie case of anticipation.

Further, Petersen fails to teach each and every element of claim 1 as claimed. Among other elements, Petersen fails to teach that the contextual metadata is associated with the user, the element of *automatically tagging contextual information related to the user, the software tool, and the first context to the data as contextual metadata upon one or more data operations being performed on the data while in the first context to which the software tool is associated*, and the element of *automatically tagging contextual information related to the user, the software tool, and the second context to the data as contextual metadata upon one or more data operations being performed on the data while in the second context to which the software tool is associated.* For at least these reasons, Petersen fails to teach each and every element of the claimed invention.

For at least these reasons, claim 1 is not anticipated by Petersen.

Claims 2-12 and 38-39 depend from claim 1 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons as discussed above.

Regarding independent claim 16, the Office action fails to identify what portion of Petersen allegedly teaches that the contextual metadata is associated with the user, and the element of *automatically tagging contextual information related to the user, the software tool, and the context to the data as contextual metadata upon one or more data operations being performed on the data while in*

the context to which the software tool is associated. For at least these reasons, the Office action fails to present a prima facie case of anticipation.

Further, Petersen fails to teach each and every element of claim 16 as claimed. Among other elements, Petersen fails to teach that the contextual metadata is associated with the user, and the element of *automatically tagging contextual information related to the user, the software tool, and the context to the data as contextual metadata upon one or more data operations being performed on the data while in the context to which the software tool is associated.* For at least these reasons, Petersen fails to teach each and every element of the claimed invention.

For at least these reasons, claim 16 is not anticipated by Petersen.

Claims 17-23 depend from claim 16 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons as discussed above.

Regarding independent claim 24, the Office action fails to identify what portion of Petersen allegedly teaches *initiating a session on a computer system for a user in the first context, wherein the first context is a digital workspace of at least one of events, subjects, relationships and resources associated with the user, automatically tagging contextual information related to the user and the first context to the data, the contextual information being at least one of information related to the first context generated automatically upon creation of the data and information related to the first context generated automatically upon one or more data operations being performed on the data while in the first context, initiating a session on a computer system for the user in the second context, wherein the second context is a digital workspace of at least one of events, subjects, relationships and resources associated with the user, and automatically tagging contextual information related to the user and the second context to the data, the*

contextual information being at least one of information related to the second context generated automatically upon creation of the data and information related to the second context generated automatically upon one or more data operations being performed on the data while in the second context. For at least these reasons, the Office action fails to present a prima facie case of anticipation.

Further, Petersen fails to teach each and every element of claim 24 as claimed. Among other elements, Petersen fails to teach *initiating a session on a computer system for a user in the first context, wherein the first context is a digital workspace of at least one of events, subjects, relationships and resources associated with the user, automatically tagging contextual information related to the user and the first context to the data, the contextual information being at least one of information related to the first context generated automatically upon creation of the data and information related to the first context generated automatically upon one or more data operations being performed on the data while in the first context, initiating a session on a computer system for the user in the second context, wherein the second context is a digital workspace of at least one of events, subjects, relationships and resources associated with the user, and automatically tagging contextual information related to the user and the second context to the data, the contextual information being at least one of information related to the second context generated automatically upon creation of the data and information related to the second context generated automatically upon one or more data operations being performed on the data while in the second context. For at least these reasons, Petersen fails to teach each and every element of the claimed invention.*

For at least these reasons, claim 24 is not anticipated by Petersen.

Claims 25-30 and 40-41 depend from claim 24 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons as discussed above.

Regarding independent claim 31, the Office action fails to identify what portion of Petersen allegedly teaches *initiating a session on a computer system for the user in the context, wherein the context is a digital workspace of at least one of events, subjects, relationships and resources associated with the user, and automatically tagging contextual information related to the user and the context to the data, the contextual information being at least one of information related to the context generated automatically upon creation of the data and information related to the context generated automatically upon one or more data operations being performed on the data while in the context*. For at least these reasons, the Office action fails to present a prima facie case of anticipation.

Further, Petersen fails to teach each and every element of claim 31 as claimed. Among other elements, Petersen fails to teach *initiating a session on a computer system for the user in the context, wherein the context is a digital workspace of at least one of events, subjects, relationships and resources associated with the user, and automatically tagging contextual information related to the user and the context to the data, the contextual information being at least one of information related to the context generated automatically upon creation of the data and information related to the context generated automatically upon one or more data operations being performed on the data while in the context*. For at least these reasons, Petersen fails to teach each and every element of the claimed invention.

For at least these reasons, claim 31 is not anticipated by Petersen.

Claims 32-35 and 41 depend from claim 31 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons as discussed above.

Regarding independent claim 36, the Office action fails to identify what portion of Petersen allegedly teaches *initiating a session on a computer system for a user in a context, wherein the context is a digital workspace of events, subjects, relationships and resources associated with the user, providing a collaboration data management tool for at least many-to-many functionality, the tool facilitates data operations on data related to at least one of data communications, data organization, data processing, and data storage, and automatically tagging contextual information related to the user to the data, the contextual information being at least one of information related to the context generated automatically upon creation of the data and information related to the context generated automatically upon one or more data operations being performed on the data*. For at least these reasons, the Office action fails to present a prima facie case of anticipation.

Further, Petersen fails to teach each and every element of claim 36 as claimed. Among other elements, Petersen fails to teach *initiating a session on a computer system for a user in a context, wherein the context is a digital workspace of events, subjects, relationships and resources associated with the user, providing a collaboration data management tool for at least many-to-many functionality, the tool facilitates data operations on data related to at least one of data communications, data organization, data processing, and data storage, and automatically tagging contextual information related to the user to the data, the contextual information being at least one of information related to the context generated automatically upon creation of the data and information related to the context generated automatically upon one or more data operations being performed on the data*. For at least these reasons, Petersen fails to teach each and every element of the claimed invention.

For at least these reasons, claim 36 is not anticipated by Petersen.

Claims 44-48 depend from claim 36 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons as discussed above.

Regarding independent claim 37, the Office action fails to identify what portion of Petersen allegedly teaches *computer-implemented means for initiating a session on a computer system for a user in the first context and the second context, wherein the first context and the second context are each a digital workspace of at least one of events, subjects, relationships and resources associated with the user; computer-implemented means for automatically tagging to the data contextual information related to the first context, the contextual information being at least one of information related to the first context generated automatically upon creation of the data and information related to the first context generated automatically upon one or more data operations being performed on the data while in the first context; and computer-implemented means for automatically tagging to the data contextual information related to the second context, the contextual information being at least one of information related to the second context generated automatically upon creation of the data and information related to the second context generated automatically upon one or more data operations being performed on the data while in the second context.* For at least these reasons, the Office action fails to present a prima facie case of anticipation.

Further, Petersen fails to teach each and every element of claim 37 as claimed. Among other elements, Petersen fails to teach *computer-implemented means for initiating a session on a computer system for a user in the first context and the second context, wherein the first context and the second context are each a digital workspace of at least one of events, subjects, relationships and resources associated with the user; computer-implemented means for automatically tagging to the data contextual information related to the first context, the contextual information being at least one of information related to the*

first context generated automatically upon creation of the data and information related to the first context generated automatically upon one or more data operations being performed on the data while in the first context; and computer-implemented means for automatically tagging to the data contextual information related to the second context, the contextual information being at least one of information related to the second context generated automatically upon creation of the data and information related to the second context generated automatically upon one or more data operations being performed on the data while in the second context. For at least these reasons, Petersen fails to teach each and every element of the claimed invention.

For at least these reasons, claim 37 is not anticipated by Petersen.

Regarding independent claim 43, the Office action fails to identify what portion of Petersen allegedly teaches the element of *a storage device that stores the user-defined data and the metadata, the metadata including information about the user*, the element of *a storage device that stores the user-defined data and the metadata, the metadata including information about a tagging component that automatically tags the user-defined data with at least one of metadata related to the user, the software application and a web page associated with the software application upon one or more data operations being performed on the user-defined data*, the element of *creating a first instance of user-defined data in a first web page to which the software application is associated*, the element of *automatically tagging the first instance of user-defined data with the metadata relating to the user, the software application and the first web page*, the element of *creating a second instance of user-defined in a second web page to which the software application is associated*, and the element of *automatically tagging the second instance of user-defined data with the metadata relating to the user, the software application and the second web page*. For at

least these reasons, the Office action fails to present a prima facie case of anticipation.

Further, Petersen fails to teach each and every element of claim 43 as claimed. Among other elements, Petersen fails to teach the element of a *storage device that stores the user-defined data and the metadata, the metadata including information about the user*, the element of a *storage device that stores the user-defined data and the metadata, the metadata including information about a tagging component that automatically tags the user-defined data with at least one of metadata related to the user, the software application and a web page associated with the software application upon one or more data operations being performed on the user-defined data*, the element of *creating a first instance of user-defined data in a first web page to which the software application is associated*, the element of *automatically tagging the first instance of user-defined data with the metadata relating to the user, the software application and the first web page*, the element of *creating a second instance of user-defined in a second web page to which the software application is associated*, and the element of *automatically tagging the second instance of user-defined data with the metadata relating to the user, the software application and the second web page*. For at least these reasons, Petersen fails to teach each and every element of the claimed invention.

For at least these reasons, claim 43 is not anticipated by Petersen.

For at least the foregoing reasons, claims 1-13 and 16-48 are in condition for allowance.

III. Newly Added Claims

Claims 49-50 have been added. No new matter has been added.

Serial No.: 10/731,906
Attorney Docket No.: LET01-GN005
Request for Continued Examination and Amendment


IV. Conclusion

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-12 and 16-50, now pending, are distinguishable from the references cited and in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of record is respectfully requested.

The Commissioner for Patents is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees that may be required by this paper, or to credit any overpayment to Deposit Account 50-3072.

If the Examiner wishes to discuss any aspect of this response, please contact the undersigned at the telephone number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,



Scott R. Stanley
Reg. No. 64,802

30074
Taft Stettinius & Hollister LLP
425 Walnut Street; Suite 1800
Cincinnati, OH 45202-3957
513-357-9616
stanley@taftlaw.com